

REMARKS

The Examiner uses McClure and Anno to reject claims 1-11, 15, 16, and 18-20 as having been obvious.

Each of the independent claims recites "publishing election results, the election results including the election selections and the unique receipt number," or similar language. This feature is completely absent from the references.

The Examiner admits that McClure fails to specifically teach or fairly suggest publishing election results as recited in independent claims 1, 15, and 20. The Examiner cites Anno and notes that "the voters often second question themselves once they cast a ballot. By incorporating receipt printing features disclosed in Anno, such doubts can be easily avoided, and therefore an obvious expedient." The applicant respectfully suggests that the Examiner's reliance is misplaced. Anno does not teach or suggest publishing election results as recited in the independent claims. Rather, Anno teaches printing voter selections, not election results, as bar codes on a piece of paper that is immediately deposited in a bar code reader by the voter. Further, contrary to the Examiner's position, this bar coded paper, even if it did contain election results (which it does not), can do nothing to accommodate voters who often second question themselves, since Anno teaches the reader-printer "renders the voting card incapable of further use by the voter."

Assuming arguendo, that there is a suggestion to combine McClure and Anno, the combination still fails to teach or suggest "publishing election results" as recited in claims 1, 15 and 20. As a result, the cited references do not anticipate or render obvious independent claims 1, 15 and 20.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the claims on which they depend.

Applicants' discussion of particular arguments of the Examiner should not be construed as a concession by applicants with respect to any other positions of the Examiner. Applicants' assertion of arguments of patentability for certain claims should not be construed as suggesting that there are not also other good reasons why those or other claims are patentable.